

Application No.: 09/817,944
Atty. Docket No. 0220-080

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13, 16 and 18-26 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 7, 11, 18-21 and 23 have been amended; claims 2, 5, 8, 9, 14 and 15 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and claims 24-26 have been added by the foregoing amendment. No new matter has been introduced as a result of these amendments/additions. Applicant respectfully requests traversal of the pending rejections in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-11, 13-16, 19 and 21-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,937,160 ("Davis"). Claims 2, 8, 18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Davis in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0028068 ("Patterson").

In exemplary embodiments, Applicant has described a method for updating content on a web site. As claims 2 and 5 have been incorporated into claim 1, the rejection of these claims will be addressed.

As recited in amended claim 1, the method comprises: accessing an update profile, the update profile comprising a uniform resource locator (URL) corresponding to the named party, an e-mail address corresponding to the named party, an update type corresponding to the named party and an update frequency corresponding to the named party; determining whether content on a web site corresponding to the named party URL is due to be updated based on the update frequency; retrieving a copy of the content on the web site based on the update type, the update type specifying a portion of the content on the website that is retrieved; submitting the copy of the content on the web site to the named party as an e-mail attachment; receiving a revised copy of the content on the web site from the named party as an e-mail attachment, wherein the revised copy reflects revisions to the copy of the content on the website made by the named party; and

Application No.: 09/817,944
Atty. Docket No. 0220-080

updating the content on the web site based on the revised copy of the content on the website received from the named party.

Davis describes a method for updating a hypertext documents via electronic email. A hypertext document, such as a web page, is automatically revised via an e-mail message transmitted by a content provider (col. 2, lines 58-61).

Davis fails to disclose, among other things, *an update profile comprising an update type corresponding to a named party and submitting a copy of the content on the web site to the named party as an e-mail attachment.*

A content manager in Davis may receive an update reminder via e-mail (col. 14, lines 20-23) but this reminder e-mail simply does not include a copy of web site content. The reminder of Davis simply prompts the content manager to submit revisions (or changes) to web site content via an e-mail. The content manager of Davis, therefore, does not receive content of a web site as an e-mail attachment.

Furthermore, Davis also fails to disclose an update type corresponding to a named party being included in an update profile of the named party (along with the URL, e-mail address and update frequency). The update type, as recited in claim 1, also determines the portions of content of the web site that is retrieved and submitted for revision.

The portions of Davis relied upon for rejecting claim 1 (i.e. col. 13, line 51 to col. 14, line 64 and Figs. 12A - 12D) are directed to creating and/or maintaining an update profile (as the term is used in the pending claims). For example, Fig. 12B-1 provides the ability to specify various contact information for a user (see 75b - 75i). The fields in Fig. 12B-2 and 12B 3 provide the ability to specify update frequency (75k) and various e-mail attributes (75l - 75u).

Application No.: 09/817,944
Atty. Docket No. 0220-080

Davis, however, does not describe an update type corresponding to a named party being included in an update profile of a named party nor does Davis disclose the update type determining which portions of content of a web site are retrieved and submitted for revision.

In rejecting claim 2 for example, Patterson is relied upon for disclosing submitting web content as an e-mail attachment. In Patterson, a user browsing a particular website may be presented with banners or pop-ups unrelated to the website being viewed. The banners may be advertisements, etc. The banner may offer to provide information about the advertiser's products and also include a form for accepting the user's contact information such as the user's e-mail address. Upon entering the address and pressing a submit button, information about the products may be submitted electronically to the user's e-mail address while maintaining the current website on the browser.

The information provided by Patterson to a recipient, however, does not provide the recipient the ability to revise the content. The recipient of the information is not the named party associated with the web site. Patterson also fails to disclose an update type of a named party being included within an update profile of the named party nor does Patterson disclose the update type determining which portions of content of a web site are retrieved and submitted for revision.

For at least these reasons, it is believed that claim 1 is allowable over the combined teachings of Davis and Patterson. Claims 3, 4, 6, 18, 19, 22 and 24, all of which depend on claim 1 are also allowable.

Independent claims 7 and 11, which are similar to claim 1 are also allowable as the Davis and Patterson documents fails to disclose exemplary embodiments as highlighted above. The

Application No.: 09/817,944
Atty. Docket No. 0220-080

remaining claims (i.e. claims 10, 13, 16, 20, 21, 23, 25 and 26), all of which depend on one of the allowable claims 7 and 11 are also allowable.

New claims 24-26 recite an update type field being one of a random type, a sequential type and a custom type as described (Specification, ¶ 008). Neither Davis nor Patterson discloses such update type fields which determine the portions of content of a web site that are retrieved and submitted for revision.

All of the rejections and objections having been overcome, it is believed this application is in condition for allowance and a prompt notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Potomac Patent Group PLLC

By: Krishna Kalidindi
Krishna Kalidindi
Registration No. 41,461

P.O. Box 270
Fredericksburg, VA 22404

Date: October 04, 2007